

REMARKS

Claims 27-40 are pending in the application. Claims 27, 28, 33, 35, and 36 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 6,151,609 (Truong) in view of US patent 7,054,952 (Schwerdtfeger et al.). Claims 29-32 and 37-40 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong in view of Schwerdtfeger and US patent publication 2003/0195886 (Vishlitzky). Claim 34 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Truong in view of Schwerdtfeger and WO 2002-095954 (Lee).

No amendments are made herein.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 103

Regarding claim 27: Examiner cites Truong's server 15 with memory 46 and mass storage 44, but does not identify editable files needed or created for production or configuration of an automation system as claimed. Applicant finds no such files described, and Truong does not mention "automation system". In Truong col. 7, lines 38-40: "*Operating system 38 and remote editor program 40 are stored in mass storage device 44 and are shown loaded into server memory 46.*" These elements 38 and 40 are not editable files in Truong, but are the operating system and editor application software that is executed on the server. FIGs 5 and 6 illustrate a display of a file being edited. This file is not for production or configuration of an automation system. It appears to be an editorial article.

FIG 3 of Truong shows a list of editable files in a path on the server 15, including such files as "Welcome.html". These are html files, and thus do not need conversion to a second format that can be processed by a remote client web browser 32. Thus, Truong does not teach or implicitly suggest conversion of file formats as claimed.

Examiner concedes that Truong does not teach converting the received files into the first format. However, Truong also does not teach converting the transmitted files from the first format into the second format. There is no explicit or implied suggestion or need for Applicant's claimed conversion in Truong, as noted above.

Examiner motivates a combination of Truong and Schwerdtfeger as follows:

- 1) To provide access to files by a client in a first format. However, the present invention provides access to files by a client in a second format, after conversion from a stored first format.
- 2) To translate a document from one file format to a script expressed into a second format. However, this is a means for a format conversion, not a motivation. Truong does not need format conversion.
- 3) "In addition it supplies a description of the elements within some portion of a particular document and includes identifiers assigned to the elements within some portion of the document". However, this is a means, not a motivation.

Thus, the combination is unmotivated. The purpose of Schwerdtfeger is to create a Document Object Model of an electronic document, especially an interactive document, so as to present only a limited portion of the document on a client with limited resources (last par. of background). This does not suggest or motivate the combination.

Furthermore the system of Schwerdtfeger is not an editor. The term "edit" is not found. In particular, Schwerdtfeger does not teach editing of files for the production or configuration of an automation system. So even if the combination is made, it does not produce the invention as claimed.

Regarding claim 33: The above arguments regarding claim 27 also apply here. Examiner cites Truong's editor 40 as receiving files created or modified by the remote client, and converting the received files from a received format into the first format. However, this is not supported by the cited lines: "*receiving a file selection from the web browser at the server, the file selection identifying one of the files; and communicating a copy of one of the files from the server to the web browser for editing;*". This citation describes a client identifying a file to be edited, and the server transferring the selected file to the client. It does not describe transferring the file from the client to the server, or a format conversion of the file.

Regarding claim 35: Examiner does not identify an access management element that only allows access to a file by one client. Examiner cites a transcoder proxy and a PDA of Schwerdtfeger, but does not indicate how either of these elements prevents access to a file by multiple clients. Without access management, multiple PDAs could use the same or multiple transcoder proxies on the same file at the same time.

Regarding claim 36: Examiner cites Truong FIG 3B, step 118. Applicant assumes FIG 3A was meant. However, step 118 is silent as to authorizing a given client to access a given selection of files. Instead it appears to grant a client access to all files on a server. Truong, col. 7, lines 17-19: *"The logon ID, password, and remote server path inputs identify a particular user and whether the user has access rights to remote Internet server 15."*

Regarding claims 31 and 39: The cited lines on pages 9 and 11 of Office Action do not describe any notification of an earliest requesting client that a later requesting client is requesting access. Thus, it does not meet the claims.

Regarding claim 32: The cited lines on bottom of page 9 of the Office Action do not relate to assigning different access priorities for different clients such that a later requesting client may override an earlier requesting client as claimed. The cited lines describe the tables shown in FIG 5 of Vishlitzky. These tables have nothing to do with client priority. They are device information tables that map all available cylinders and tracks on a storage device. Clients are not listed in these tables. Furthermore, the listed devices, cylinders, and tracks are not picked by order in the table. The tables represent direct access storage devices, so the cylinders and tracks can be selected randomly by a requesting process as needed. This capability is necessary for the purpose of Vishlitzky, which is to copy only the tracks needed by a process at a given time into virtual storage, rather than a whole volume. Even if the devices, tracks, or cylinders of the table "signified priority by picking the first one on the list" as held by Examiner, it would not meet the claim, because it does not give a later requesting client a priority that overrides an earlier requesting client as claimed in claim 32.

Regarding claim 40: Examiner has not described how the cited lines teach the assigning of priorities to clients such that an earlier requesting client who has locked a resource is notified that control will be switched to a later requesting client with a higher priority. The above arguments regarding claim 32 also apply here.

Regarding claim 34: The arguments regarding claim 27 and 33 above apply. The "vice versa" element is not found in Schwerdtfeger, who only teaches the display of files, not editing of files, so format conversion is performed only one-way in Schwerdtfeger.

Lee does not address the deficiencies of Truong and Schwerdtfeger as argued above.

Conclusion

M.P.E.P. 2143.03 provides that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.

As argued above, the proposed combinations are not motivated and do not produce the invention as claimed, so they do not support the obviousness rejections. The formal objections have been addressed. Applicants feel this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 23, 2009

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830